

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 16-24 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-13 and 17-24 were objected to for informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 16-24 to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,775,258 (“Valkenburg”). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)” which states, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Applicants respectfully submit that Valkenburg does not describe each and every element of the claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method “of locating communicating mobile objects in a communications network” comprising in addition to other elements/steps “allocating a timer (CTF) to each repeater (Fi) at the moment when this is generated, so that

upon expiry of a selected duration, it addresses to at least one location server (SL) of the network the said location identifier of the next repeater ($F(i+1)$) or site ($H(i+1)$) in order that this is stored in the server (SL) as correspondence of a primary identifier of the second object (A).” Independent claim 14 recites similar limitations.

In contrast, Valkenburg does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 14. Valkenburg is concerned with providing a new apparatus and associated method to route data in fast changing ad hoc wireless network such as Bluetooth scatternet.

The Office Action asserts that the time out procedure for each entry in the routing table (Col. 9, lines 15-30) meets the above-emphasized claim limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In column 9, lines 18 and 19, Valkenburg discloses that “when the time out expires, the entry is removed from the table.” Valkenburg further explains that this timeout is renewed every time that a request is received. In sum, Valkenburg discloses renewing a timeout for an entry every time it is used, and deleting this entry if this timeout expires.

However, renewing a timeout for an entry every time it is used, and deleting this entry if this timeout expires is not the same as “allocating a timer (CTF) to each repeater (F_i) at the moment when this is generated, so that upon expiry of a selected duration, it addresses to at least one location server (SL) of the network the said location identifier of the next repeater ($F(i+1)$) or site ($H(i+1)$) in order that this is stored in the server (SL) as correspondence of a primary identifier of the second object (A).” That is, Valkenburg and independent claims 1 and 14 operate very differently. In Valkenburg, the entry is removed whereas in claim 1, an entry is forwarded to a server. In Valkenburg, once the entry has been removed from the table, any further entry in the routing table corresponding with the packet broadcast to the slaves of the piconet will time out (column 9, lines 20 to 23). In contrast, the method of claim 1 prevents this very issue by recording the location identifier in the location server after the timeout period.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Here, Valkenburg fails to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1 and 14.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and independent claims 1 and 14 be allowed. Further, claims 2-13 and 15-24 depend from one of claims 1 or 14 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in Valkenburg.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6/23/10

By Brian J. McNamara Reg. No. 32,789

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5416
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

 Brian J. McNamara
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,789